



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/616,249	07/09/2003	Tsunetaro Matsuoka	450101-02997.1	9487

7590 10/18/2005

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG, LLP.
10TH FLOOR
745 FIFTH AVENUE
NEW YORK, NY 10151

EXAMINER

MARC, MCDIEUNEL

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3661

DATE MAILED: 10/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/616,249	MATSUOKA ET AL.
	Examiner McDieunel Marc	Art Unit 3661

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 October 2005.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) _____ is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 19-24, 27 and 29-30 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) 28 is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 9 July 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____. 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 19-24 and 27-30 are presented for examination.
2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 19-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

As per claim 19-24, 27 and 28-30, Conklin et al. teaches "A multivariate negotiations engine for iterative bargaining which: enables a sponsor to create and administer a community between participants such as buyers and sellers having similar interests; allows a buyer/participant to search and evaluate seller information, propose and negotiate orders and counteroffers that include all desired terms, request sample quantities, and track activity; allows a seller/participant to use remote authoring templates to create a complete Website for immediate integration and activation in the community, to evaluate proposed buyer orders and counteroffers, and to negotiate

multiple variables such as prices, terms, conditions etc., iteratively with a buyer. The system provides secure databases, search engines, and other tools for use by the sponsor, which enable the sponsor to define the terms of community participation, establish standards, help promote the visibility of participating companies, monitor activity, collect fees, and promote successes. All this is done through a multivariate negotiations engine system operated at the system provider's Internet site, thus requiring no additional software at the sponsors', or participant sellers', or buyer's sites. This also allows buyers and sellers to use and negotiate payment options and methods that are accepted internationally. The system maintains internal databases that contain the history of all transactions in each community, so that sponsors, buyers and sellers may retrieve appropriate records to document each stage of interaction and negotiation. Documents are created by the system during the negotiation process.", which equates to a commercial transaction system comprising: a robotic apparatus manager that manages; a product distributor that acquires the predetermined information under a contact having been made, appends it to a product for sale to a user of the robotic apparatus; detects the predetermined information appended to the product purchased by the user and acts or reacts in a predetermined manner based on the detected predetermined information.... Cinklin et al. does not specifically teach the limitations below.

Knight et al. teaches a robot type having a robotic apparatus so that the robotic apparatus acts or reacts when it detects predetermined information; with the robotic apparatus manager (see fig. 4, particularly robot#1 to robot#n).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify the business method of Conklin et al. with the robot type of knight et al., because this modification would have introduce the use of using a robot a robot to manage queries, thereby improving the commercial transaction method of the robot.

Allowable Subject Matter

4. Claim 28 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.
5. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art of record fail to teach or fairly suggest a robot wherein the product is selected from a group consisting of a personal computer, a mobile telephone, canned juice, bagged candy or CD case in combination with the other features of the claimed invention.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to McDieunel Marc whose telephone number is (571) 272-6964. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-5:00 Mon-Thu.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black can be reached on (571) 272-6956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


McDieunel Marc

Sunday, October 16, 2005

MM/